

S. Fujii et al.
U.S. Serial No. 10/068,414
Page 6 of 8

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 17 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11-16 are pending in the application. Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 4, which is canceled without prejudice. Also, independent claim 7 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 10, which is canceled without prejudice. Further, independent claim 13 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 17, which is canceled without prejudice. The amendments are fully supported by the application as originally filed.

Applicants' claimed invention is directed to an image sending method and an image sending device which includes selecting/setting the following three properties: sending mode, image quality, and image resolution (see, e.g., independent claims 1, 7, and 13).

As amended, independent claims 1, 7, and 13 recite selecting and setting a sending mode for sending image data from plural types of sending modes, where the sending mode is selected and set based on sending destination information inputted or selected by a user. The claimed invention further recites "selecting and setting a resolution corresponding to the selected image quality from a range of applicable resolutions for the selected sending mode" (see, e.g., claim 1).

In the Applicants' claimed invention, "sending mode" refers to the sending destination selected by a user (see, e.g., specification at page 13, last paragraph). For example, the sending mode can be selected from facsimile, email, and FTP (see page 11, second paragraph).

Claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11, and 13-16 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,437,881 to Baba et al. ("Baba"). Claims 4, 10, and 17 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baba in view of U.S. Patent 6,614,551 to Peek. Claims 6 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Baba in view of U.S. Patent 6,590,673 to Kadowaki. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

S. Fujii et al.
U.S. Serial No. 10/068,414
Page 7 of 8

As amended, independent claims 1, 7, and 13 incorporate the subject matter of claims 3, 10, and 17, respectively. Therefore, the rejection of claims 4, 10, and 17 over the proposed combination of Baba in view of Peek will now be addressed.

The proposed combination of Baba in view of Peek does not teach or suggest an image sending method or an image sending device in which a sending destination and image quality are selected by a user, and a resolution corresponding to the selected image quality is set **based on the selected sending destination**.

In Baba, resolution is varied depending on the type of image information (such as character or picture information), but is not varied based on a sending destination selected by the user.

Regarding the rejection of claims 4, 10, and 17, the Peek reference was cited for allegedly teaching the selection of a sending mode. In particular, column 6, lines 1-37 of Peek discloses a fax machine capable of determining if a transmission is a fax transmission or an email transmission. However, Peek does not teach or suggest selecting and setting a resolution based **on the selected sending mode or sending destination**. Therefore, Peek does not remedy the deficiencies of Baba.

Regarding independent claim 13, Baba does not teach or suggest setting a processing of contents based on an image sending route or sending destination information.

Claim 13 recites setting a processing of content based on an image sending route and an image quality, where "image sending route" can include, e.g., a telephone line, the Internet, an intranet, LAN, CATV, VPN, etc. (see specification at page 22, lines 3-19). Baba simply does not refer to an image sending route or sending destination in setting a processing of content.

On page 2 of the Office Action of 08/17/2006, it was alleged that a "sending speed qualifies as a sending mode or route ... such as fast-speed route, slow-speed route."

S. Fujii et al.
U.S. Serial No. 10/068,414
Page 8 of 8

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 17 2006

However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Baba that high-speed transmission or low-speed transmission are by different routes. Instead, the speed of transmission is clearly linked to image quality (see column 6, lines 20-29 of Baba). In Baba, there is merely a single route over which data may be sent at different speeds.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the proposed combination of Baba in view of Peck does not teach or suggest an image sending method or an image sending device as recited in independent claims 1, 7, and 13.

It is believed that the claims are in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 17, 2006

By: 

Steven M. Jensen
(Reg. No. 42,693)

Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205

Phone: (617) 439-4444

Customer No. 21874